

Subject: Re: Follow-up email to questions on port security  
From: Brad Racino <bradracino@inewssource.org>  
Date: 11/6/18, 1:42 PM  
To: susan.lawson@navy.mil

Ms. Lawson,

Thank you for your detailed response. After I received your email a few hours ago, I went to the bay, got on a boat and took photos, video and notes of what was happening at the three shipyards (I'd be willing to share the photos and videos with you, if you would like -- just let me know).

Could you please help me reconcile what I saw and documented and what I am reading in NAVSEA 009-72 with the Navy's recent response to my questions about security?

At Continental Maritime, the U.S.S. Chosin is unguarded. There are no patrol boat accompanying this ship. I have been past this ship three times in the past two months, and never witnessed a patrol boat.

-According to NAVSEA 009-72 (FY-19), amphibious ships, surface combatants and auxiliary ships require a waterborne security boat within 200 yards of the vessel.

At BAE, there are six ships, two in drydock. There is one patrol boat accompanying all six ships. I have been past this shipyard three times in the past two months, and have only ever seen one patrol boat.

-According to NAVSEA 009-72 (FY-19), amphibious ships, surface combatants and auxiliary ships require a waterborne security boat within 200 yards of the vessel.

-According to NAVSEA 009-72 (FY-19), "floating drydocks shall be protected commensurate with the provisions of the docked asset."

-According to NAVSEA 009-72 (FY-19) Addendum One to Attachment A:

"Waterborne security boats must be capable of conducting continuous patrols in the immediate vicinity of the protected asset(s), or continuous monitoring of a patrol zone when assigned to protect clustered U.S. Naval Assets (a patrol zone shall not exceed 200 yards and **shall not include more than 3 protected assets**)."

 [emphasis added]

Therefore, it *appears* that both Continental Maritime and BAE are not in compliance with NAVSEA 009-72 today, nor were they in compliance any of the other days.

But I may be misreading 009-72, or not taking something into consideration? Please advise, and thank you again for your help.

-Brad

Lawson, Susan E CIV CNRMC, CNRMC wrote on 11/6/18 9:24 AM:

Brad,

I wanted to follow up with you on your questions regarding security in the private yards in San Diego.

First, please note, we cannot speak in specifics when it comes to security. What I can say is that all private shipyards under contract to execute maintenance work on Navy ships are required to provide robust physical security. I can also tell you that the Navy's Regional Maintenance Centers conduct reviews of its security posture several times a year at private shipyards with the Fleet to ensure our contractors are meeting their contractual obligations. The Navy does not, however, disclose its port security measures, tactics or procedures.

All private shipyards under contract to execute new construction or maintenance work on Navy ships are required to provide physical security in accordance with NAVSEA Standard Item 009-72, which addresses physical security requirements for a private contractor facility. NAVSEA Standard Item 009-72 is included in all contracts and oversight is provided by local Navy representatives.

Additionally, I have spoken with our stakeholder organizations to answer your earlier questions. The information they provided is as follows:

Q1: What is the average annual line-item funding the Navy gave to the big 3 private yards in SD (Continental, BAE and NASSCO) for security patrol boats?

RESPONSE: That information is business/competition sensitive and its release would impact the Navy's ability to secure required services at the best possible price.

Q2: Who is conducting oversight of the private shipyards to ensure they are conducting security sweeps with the patrol boats funded by the Navy?

RESPONSE: The Navy conducts reviews of its security posture at private shipyards and has not found any lapses or concerns. When in plant, the availability project team has the continued responsibility to ensure the contractor is meeting its contractual obligations, one of which is meeting the Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection (ATFP) requirement. In San Diego, SWRMC's security personnel conduct regular reviews of security protocols at the three major yards in San Diego and have no significant concerns with security at those facilities.

If you have additional questions, I will help staff those, or connect you with the appropriate points of contact. Standing by to support. Thanks!

Very respectfully,

Susan Lawson  
Congressional & Public Affairs Officer

Re: Follow-up email to questions on port security

Commander, Navy Regional Maintenance Center  
9170 Second Street – CEP-200  
Norfolk, VA 23511  
(757) 400-3049 (desk)  
(757) 701-6646 (work cell)

--

**BRAD RACINO** | Senior Reporter & Assistant Director

[inewssource.org](http://inewssource.org)

c. (845) 553-4170

t. [@bradracino](https://twitter.com/bradracino)